

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are pending. Claims 1-3 and 5-20 were rejected in the Final Office Action dated August 28, 2009. Claims 1, 5, 7, and 15 are currently amended.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103*

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-13, 15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,805,907 to Hagiwara ("Hagiwara").

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiwara in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,856,787 to Itkis ("Itkis").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiwara in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,621,814 to Stepan ("Stepan").

Independent claims 1, 7 and 15 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that Hagiwara fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 1 and thus fails to anticipate claims 1, as discussed below.

Hagiwara fails to teach the claim 1 limitations of:

“two or more game terminals operated by the single processor of the control module for controlling the system and configured to concurrently present the wagering events generated by the single processor for controlling the system, the first game type including the first wagering event to a first player at a first terminal and the second game type including the second wagering event to a second player at a second terminal, the two or more game terminals configured to communicate with the control module through at least one communication interface, each of the two or more game terminals having a switch configured to communicate with a plurality of gaming components housed within each of the two or more game terminals;” and

“at least one communication interface connected to the control module, the at least one

communication interface configured to send data to and receive data from a first game terminal and a second game terminal to thereby concurrently provide the first wagering event to a first player at the first terminal and a second wagering event to a second player at the second terminal.”

Hagiwara discloses “a slot machine which comprises one main machine and a plurality of subordinate machines connected to the main machine.” Abstract.

This is further confirmed by the following disclosure of Hagiwara:

In the conventional slot machine described above, one slot machine is played by one player alone. While playing, the player of one machine does not communicate with the players of other machines. The players of the slot machines tend to play individual machines isolated from one another.

This invention has been made in view of this shortcoming of the conventional slot machine. The object of this invention is to provide a slot machine which enables the players of individual machines to have feeling of togetherness thereby to enjoy games more.

Col. 1, lines 20-30.

Hagiwara also fails to teach all of the limitations of independent claims 7 and 15 for the same reasons. Thus the pending claims, as amended, cannot be anticipated by Hagiwara and are submitted to be novel and in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §102.

The addition of Itkis and Stepan fails to remedy the deficiency in the teachings of Hagiwara, and it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hagiwara, alone or in combination with Itkis and Stepan.

Therefore, claims are respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance, which is hereby requested.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 5 was objected to because of informalities, which have been addressed by amendment.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is being filed herewith. It is respectfully requested that this Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement be considered and the PTO Form 1449 be initialed and returned with the next Action.

## **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of its allowance is solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Peter G. Mikhail/

Peter G. Mikhail  
Reg. No. 46,930

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
510-663-1100